

November 2014

## Larsen's Legacy: The Three-Part Exposition and the New Formenlehre

Nathan John Martin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://remix.berklee.edu/haydn-journal>

---

### Recommended Citation

Martin, Nathan John (2014) "Larsen's Legacy: The Three-Part Exposition and the New Formenlehre," *HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America*: Vol. 4 : No. 2 , Article 2.  
Available at: <https://remix.berklee.edu/haydn-journal/vol4/iss2/2>

## **Larsen's Legacy: The Three-Part Exposition and the New *Formenlehre***

by Nathan John Martin

### *Abstract*

Both James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy's Sonata Theory and William Caplin's theory of formal functions give prominent place to sonata expositions that lack, in any traditional sense, an obvious subordinate theme—Hepokoski and Darcy through their category of the “continuous exposition” and Caplin through his notion of “transition/subordinate theme fusion.” Such expositions are a prominent feature of Haydn's compositional practice, and have long been discussed by specialists writing on his music. In particular, in his 1963 essay “Sonataform-Probleme,” Jens Peter Larsen held up Haydn's “three-part expositions” as an alternative to the standard, A. B. Marx-derived “two-part” model. Following Michelle Fillion's, Alexander Ludwig's, and Jan Miyake's leads, my paper revisits Larsen's original formulation in an attempt to illuminate its relationship to Caplin's and Hepokoski and Darcy's conceptions. The analytical examples are drawn from Haydn's Piano Sonata in C minor, Hob. XVI:20 and his String Quartets, Op. 33 no. 1 and Op. 74 no. 3.

This article is a revised version of the paper I read at the Seventh International Conference on Music Theory, Tallinn, Estonia, January 7, 2014. Research towards this project was generously funded by the Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek-Vlaanderen in the form of a Marie Curie Pegasus Postdoctoral Fellowship.

## I. Introduction

Seasoned teachers of music appreciation will recall the fourth edition of Kerman and Tomlinson's *Listen*, not least for the mischievous spirit that induced its authors to introduce sonata form to aspiring appreciators by means of an example having no obvious subordinate theme, while advising those auditors all the while to wait expectantly for that theme.<sup>1</sup> The effect of this approach, with its curious channeling of Beckett's *En attendant Godot*, was no doubt amusing for the teacher, but it tended towards the pedagogically disastrous, and in later editions the offending example—the first movement of Haydn's Symphony No. 88 in G major—was quietly dropped and a new one substituted in its place (the Symphony No. 95 in C minor). The didactic difficulty was thus resolved, but at the price, perhaps, of a more honest engagement with Haydn's style. For a striking feature of Haydn's music, and one that many previous commentators have underscored, is how poorly it meshes with certain received opinions regarding sonata form.<sup>2</sup> Subordinate themes gone AWOL, for instance, are by no means an anomaly in Haydn. To speak impressionistically for a moment, his sonata expositions often seem to unfold in much the following way: one hears an initial, relatively compact main theme that is followed by a transition, and then more transition, and then more transition, until at last there is an emphatic authentic cadence in the subordinate key. Quite obviously, the effect is very different from any grand opposition between a forward-striving *Hauptsatz* and a more contemplative—even “feminine”—*Seitensatz* of the kind that commentators (thinking primarily of a later practice) have perpetuated ever since A. B. Marx.

Perhaps the first writer to address this cognitive dissonance head-on was Jens Peter Larsen, who published a short article on “Sonateform-Probleme” in 1963.<sup>3</sup> Larsen set

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Kerman and Gary Tomlinson, *Listen*, 4th ed. (Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999).

<sup>2</sup> See, most recently, Markus Neuwirth, “Recomposed Recapitulations in the Sonata-Form Movements of Joseph Haydn and His Contemporaries” (Ph.D. dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2013).

<sup>3</sup> Jens Peter Larsen, “Sonateform-Probleme,” in *Festschrift Friederich Blume zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Anna Amalie Abert and Wilhelf Pfannkuch (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1963), 221-30; translated as “Sonata-

out from two eminently reasonable, if not always sufficiently digested, observations about received accounts of sonata form. First, those accounts originate in a *pedagogical* tradition. Marx's immediate concern, for instance, was to teach young bourgeois gentlemen to compose.<sup>4</sup> The characteristic act of much subsequent *Formenlehre*, however, has been to *analyze*. This *ad hoc* repurposing of a pedagogical tradition's conceptual resources has afflicted modern *Formenlehre* with a significant tension: if one's aim is to teach composition, then it does not matter if the forms held up for emulation are representative; they need only be exemplary. On the other hand, music theorists and historians preoccupied with the analytical explication of the music of the past require a set of music-theoretical categories that correspond, however approximately, to the range of formal possibilities exemplified in the corpus under study. To make matters worse, the model that Marx in fact held up as exemplary—and the one that through his immense influence became codified as the prototypical model of sonata form *tout court*—happened to have been extrapolated from Beethoven's compositional practice.<sup>5</sup> The possibility thus looms large that the paradigm Marx posited might sit poorly with the formal procedures of earlier repertoires, and indeed, as even a passing acquaintance with Haydn's output indeed suggests, it often does.

In particular, as Larsen went on to insist, the "thematic dualism" (*Themendualismus*) that Marx did much to institutionalize—the insistence that an exposition be structured around the opposition between a main (*Haupt-*) and a subordinate theme (*Seitenthema*)—results in a historical illusion that makes two of Haydn's most characteristic practices appear as anomalous deviations from "the" Classical norm: that of 1) basing both the main- and subordinate-theme functions on the same characteristic

---

Form Problems" by Ulrich Krämer [*recte*: Gerald C Graue], in *Handel, Haydn, and the Viennese Classical Style* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988); translation reprinted in *HAYDN: The Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 3.2 (Fall 2013).

<sup>4</sup> On the implications of these matters of social class for Marx's theorizing, see in particular Ludwig Holtmeier, "Feindliche Übernahme: Gottfried Weber, Adolf Bernhard Marx und die bürgerliche Harmonielehre des 19. Jahrhunderts," *Musik und Aesthetik* 63/2 (2012): 5-25.

<sup>5</sup> On Marx and Beethoven, see especially Scott Burnham, "Criticism, Faith, and the *Idee*: A. B. Marx's Early Reception of Beethoven," *19<sup>th</sup>-Century Music* 13 (1990): 183-92.

motives (monothematicism), and of 2) dispensing with a clearly delineated subordinate theme altogether. The first procedure, Haydn's "monothematicism," has been widely discussed by scholars. The second, until recently, was much less frequently addressed. But it is here, perhaps, in his positing of a "three-part exposition" (*eine Dreiteilung der Exposition*), that Larsen's influence on current *Formenlehre* has been at its most pregnant and most pronounced.

## II. Larsen's "Three-part Exposition"

A three-part exposition, in Larsen's sense, has no subordinate theme. Instead, a tonally closed main theme (*Hauptthema*) gives way to a central "expansion section" (*Entwicklungspartie*), which is followed by a "closing group" (*Schlußgruppe* or *Schlußthema*). The type's distinguishing mark is thus the presence of an expansion section, but unfortunately (if perhaps inevitably) Larsen describes this section primarily in terms of what it is *not*:

The elaboration section may be based on the main theme—Marx's "*Periode mit aufgelöstem Nachsatz*—or it may not: it is made up more or less in the manner of a development, combining together free spinning-out [*Fortspinnung*] with a succession of varying motives. Tonally it conforms to the section of the exposition customarily called the "bridge passage" [*Überleitung*] or "transition" [*Vermittlung*].<sup>6</sup>

An expansion section is *not*, that is, a "normative" transition plus subordinate theme (notice how the presumed normativity of the "dualistic" model has slipped back in).

---

<sup>6</sup> "Die Entwicklungspartie mag vom Hauptthema ausgehen—Marx' '*Periode mit aufgelöstem Nachsatz*'—oder nicht: sie setzt sich durchführungsartig aus freier Fortspinnung und Reihung wechselnder Motive zusammen. Tonal entspricht sie dem gewöhnlich als 'Überleitung' oder 'Vermittlung' bezeichneten Teil der Exposition, aber während dieser Abschnitt sonst verhältnismäßig früh zu Ende geht, um dem Seitenthema in der Dominante als zweite formalen Hauptfaktor (neben dem Hauptthema) Platz zu machen, ist hier die Entwicklung selbst der zweiten formale Hauptfaktor, nicht bloß eine sekundäre 'Vermittlung'" (Larsen, "Sonateform-Probleme," 226). For the "*Periode mit aufgelöstem Nachsatz*," see Adolf Bernhard Marx, *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition, praktisch-theoretisch*, 4 vols. (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1837-1847), 3:260-62.

While such a section certainly begins like a transition, *instead* of proceeding to a subordinate theme, it continues on “in the manner of a development” (*durchführungsartig*). And to delineate this “developmental” character more precisely, Larsen borrows Wilhelm Fischer’s term *Fortspinnung*.<sup>7</sup>

As for how the *Entwicklungspartie* ends, Larsen does not say. But implicitly, its boundary is marked by the onset of the closing theme, just as “normally” the transition’s ending is defined contextually by the beginning of the subordinate theme. This being so, it would seem imperative that Larsen distinguish sharply between the respective profiles of subordinate and of closing themes. Yet the distinction remains impressionistic and loosely drawn:

The formal significance of the closing group also differs from that in the textbook type. The textbook type usually includes a second, in itself dispensable, melodic concentration whose function in relation to the entire movement is not entirely clear. In our three-part exposition type, on the other hand, the closing group appears quite logically as a marker of a long-awaited relaxation, the repose on the dominant after the preceding development of tonal tension.<sup>8</sup>

Some of this description’s nebulousness carries over into Larsen’s analyses. His first example, from the Keyboard Sonata in C Minor, Hob. XVI:20 (see Example 1 in Appendix, p. 20), begins with an 8-bar period. This tight-knit main theme is followed by a transition-like passage that leads to a half cadence on V/E-flat in bar 19; that goal harmony is expanded for a full seven measures, and then, from the second half of bar

---

<sup>7</sup> Wilhelm Fischer, “Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Wiener klassischen Stils,” *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 3 (1915): 24-84.

<sup>8</sup> “Auch die formale Bedeutung der Schlußgruppe ist anders als im Lehrbuchtypus. Dort enthält sie meistens eine an sich entbehrliche, zweite melodische Konzentration (neben dem Seitenthema), deren Funktion im Satzganzen nicht ganz klar ist; in unserem dreiteiligen Expositionstypus erscheint sie dagegen ganz logisch als Markierung der endlich eingetretenen Entspannung, der Ruhe auf der Dominante nach vorausgegangener tonaler Spannungsentwicklung” (Larsen, “Sonateform-Probleme,” 226-27).

26, a new section entirely supported by cadential harmony begins: the initiating I<sup>6</sup> chord in bar 26 projects cadential closure for the downbeat of bar 28. There, however, the cadence is evaded (Janet Schmalfeldt's one-more-time technique), and the initiating tonic seized again.<sup>9</sup> In bar 29, the music gets spectacularly stuck on the dominant, with b-flat' covering the projected e-flat' at the half bar of that measure and then working its way up a seventh to a-flat'' by the half-bar of bar 31. The tonic chord of bar 32 represents a new initiation, not the goal tonic of the cadential progression that precedes it, and the exposition does not reach its structural close until the PAC completed in bar 37. In this instance, Larsen's expansion section runs from bars 9-26, with bars 26-37 providing the subsequent closing group.

Larsen's other two examples only complicate matters. In the opening allegro of the Symphony No. 82 in C major ("L'Ours"), his main theme encompasses both an initial eight-measure passage that ends with a tonic PAC and a second section leading to a rhetorically elaborated HC, still in the tonic. His expansion section follows, beginning with the main theme's incipit and carrying on past the first HC on the dominant to the end of the ensuing pedal. His closing group, finally, includes both a sententially-structured theme in G major and a string of concluding codettas. In the first allegro from the Symphony No. 97 in C major, Larsen's main theme takes in the exposition's first two tonic PACs; his expansion section runs past two possible V:HCs to the movement's first textural break; and his closing group encompasses both a complete subordinate-key theme and subsequent codettas. Thus, while the C-minor Sonata's exposition is genuinely hard to parse according to the two-part template, it is hard to see what exactly distinguishes the two symphonies' "closing groups" from subordinate themes in the ordinary sense.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See Janet Schmalfeldt, "Cadential Processes: The Evaded Cadence and the 'One More Time' Technique," *Journal of Musicological Research* 12 (1992): 1-52.

<sup>10</sup> Compare James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, "The Medial Caesura and Its Role in the Eighteenth-Century Sonata Exposition," *Music Theory Spectrum* 19 (1997): 127n21. For a somewhat more charitable take on (implicitly) Larsen's analysis of the Symphony no. 97, see Jan Miyake, "Readdressing Haydn's Formal Models: Common Paths Through Expositions," *Theory and Practice* 34 (2009): 44-45.

Yet whatever shortcomings mar Larsen's own analyses, Haydn's compositional output by no means lacks for other, and more persuasive, instances of the abstract structure he describes. And for this reason, the three-part exposition remains profoundly attractive as an analytical construct. It is thus no great surprise that his three-part model has been frequently embraced by scholars working on Haydn, first by Michelle Fillion and more recently by Jan Miyake and Alexander Ludwig.<sup>11</sup>

### *III. The "Three-Part Exposition" in the New Formenlehre*

Still, the preeminent appropriation of Larsen's idea in the recent theoretical literature is undoubtedly in James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy's "Sonata Theory," where Larsen's category is refashioned into the "continuous exposition." Continuous expositions fall into two distinct classes. In the first, an incipient transition gives way to a series of "*Fortspinnung* modules" that eventually bring a perfect authentic cadence in the subordinate key (the *essential expositional closure*, or EEC); in the second, a "premature" perfect authentic cadence in the subordinate key is followed by reiterations of that cadence leading to the eventual EEC.<sup>12</sup> The first of these two subtypes, as the authors have always generously acknowledged, corresponds in essence to Larsen's three-part type. And, I would add, Sonata Theory's reformulation represents a considerable refinement of Larsen's version in its description the expansion section's normative ending. For by Sonata Theory's definition, an expansion section ends with the EEC—that is with a subordinate-key PAC. And with that stipulation, many of the confusions besetting Larsen's analyses can be dissolved.

---

<sup>11</sup> Michelle Fillion, "Sonata Exposition Procedures in Haydn's Keyboard Sonatas," in *Haydn Studies: Proceedings of the International Haydn Congress, Washington, D.C., 1975*, ed. Jens Peter Larsen, Howard Serwer, and James Webster (New York: Norton, 1981), 475-81; Miyake, "Haydn's Formal Models"; Alexander Ludwig, "Three-Part Expositions in the String Quartets of Joseph Haydn," (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 2010); and Ludwig, "Expecting the Unexpected: Haydn's Three-Part Expositions," *Lumen* 32 (2013): 31-40. See also A. Peter Brown, *Joseph Haydn's Keyboard Music* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 295; Charles Rosen, *Sonata Forms*, revised ed. (New York: Norton, 1988), 100-104; and James Webster, *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 166, 326.

<sup>12</sup> James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types and Deformations in the Late Eighteenth-Century Sonata* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 52-63.



Sonata Theory also offers an improved characterization of the expansion section's middle part. Since, its authors hold, the two-part template is the more common generic option, a "competent listener," one "adequate to the demands of the piece," begins by expecting that a given exposition will cycle through the typical zones of P, TR, and S.<sup>13</sup> However, "when we are presented instead with a continuous exposition of the expansion-section subtype, there is usually a moment of psychological conversion . . . a personal understanding at some mid-expositional point that the more standard, two-part form is not going to be realized."<sup>14</sup> Or again:

As we move through most later-eighteenth-century continuous expositions, what we at first suppose is an ongoing TR (on its way to an MC) continues past the last possible S-point, or what we designate as the *point of conversion* . . . Sensing that TR has passed beyond this conceptual point forces our reassessment of what is occurring generically. We come to realize that we are dealing instead with an expansion section.<sup>15</sup>

This conversion can be negotiated along a continuum of ways: first, the music heard initially as a transition might send no signals whatsoever that a medial caesura is nigh and may simply continue on its way until the EEC, as in Hepokoski and Darcy's *locus classicus*, the finale of the String Quartet in B minor, Op. 33 no. 1; or the music might lock on to the goal-key's dominant, but then contrive to move away—the kind of "bait-and-switch" that is on offer, they hold, in Op. 33 no. 3; or finally, it might lock on to the dominant, drive through to the MC, but then not continue to S (their lead example is Haydn's Symphony No. 96).<sup>16</sup> All three characterizations clearly imply that the beginning of an expansion section is indistinguishable from the beginning of a

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 52-53.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 52.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 52.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 53-58.

transition, otherwise there could be no process of conversion. And indeed, the expansion section might also go on to include a dominant lock or even a potential MC (a “medial caesura effect”), that is to say, to encompass an essentially complete transition function within itself.

It is clear, then, how an expansion section should begin and end: it begins just like a transition, and it ends with a subordinate-key PAC. This is already a considerable improvement over Larsen. I also find the idea of a point—or perhaps rather a process—of conversion compelling as a general description of the expansion section’s middle. Where I think there is still some room for refinement lies in characterizing this middle more precisely.

When it comes to describing phrase-level formal organization, Hepokoski and Darcy generally reach for William Caplin’s intra-thematic (or phrase-) functions. I’ll follow that lead by picking up their analysis of the finale from the String Quartet, Op. 33 no. 1 (see Example 2 in Appendix, p.22) and expanding upon it in Caplinian terms. In this movement, transition (or apparent-transition) function sets in at bar 13, and the section begun there continues almost without pause until the V:PAC reached in bar 47, or better, in bar 51.<sup>17</sup> So the beginning and the ending strategies are clear: model-sequence technique for the section’s initiation, on the one hand, and then continuation and cadential phrases for its end—the former beginning (retrospectively) in bar 31, once it becomes clear that the IV-chord reached in bar 33 is the initiating harmony of a Prinner and not the predominant of an ECP;<sup>18</sup> the latter when we reach the real initiating tonic

---

<sup>17</sup> I prefer to hear what happens on the downbeat of bar 47 as an evaded cadence, with the actual point of cadential arrival coming in bar 51, at the end of the repetition of the cadential unit (bars 47-52=bars 43-46 plus the imagined final tonic that is overwritten in bar 47), exactly in the manner of Schmalfeldt’s one-more-time technique. Usually, of course, an evaded cadence is given certain more explicit markers—a I<sup>6</sup> chord replacing the expected final I, melodic scale degree  $\hat{3}$  or  $\hat{5}$  in place of the expected  $\hat{1}$ , or both. These markers serve to clarify aurally that the tonic chord in question is an *initial* and not a *final* tonic. In this case, since the particular specimen lacks such markers, the distinction is subject to the listener’s intending—to my hearing the chord as the one or the other. Performers can of course choose to bias their auditors one way or the other through the manner of their execution.

<sup>18</sup> On the Prinner, see chapter three of Robert O. Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

in bar 43. The “point of conversion,” then, at which our normative expectation of a two-part exposition was relinquished, must have occurred somewhere around bars 27-30. Now, if we consider these measures in the abstract, we obtain a surprising result: as is much clearer when the passage is isolated from its context, the harmony in these measures (bars 27-30) prolongs the local root-position tonic by means of a double-neighboring motions involving  $V_4$  and  $V_5$ . Moreover, the segment falls into two two-measure groups, the first of which presents a basic idea, and the second a dominant-version of the same. This, quite clearly, is a textbook example of what Caplin calls presentation function.<sup>19</sup> But if so, then the subordinate theme is not incomplete after all: it is right there staring at us in its entirety. In context, though, its beginning is obscured, for the D-major focus of the opening tonic prolongation emerges only as a further link in the preceding sequential chain. This fact, together with the textural and motivic continuities, makes it hard to hear bars 27-30 as a new initiation.<sup>20</sup>

I very much doubt, indeed, that hearing a new initiating function in bars 27-31 will be many listeners' first impulse. It is nonetheless unclear that such *prime intenzioni* ought be the yardsticks of our eventual analyses. For a long time, I heard bars 13-51 as comprising a single, indivisible span, an undifferentiated *Entwicklungspartie* very much in Larsen's sense. And it is perhaps worthwhile, in this context, to linger for a moment on the theoretical consequences of that hearing. Heard thus, the passage is quite obviously *both* the middle part of continuous exposition *and* an instance of what Caplin calls form-functional fusion.<sup>21</sup> The broader theoretical point is therefore this: that appealing to Caplin's phrase functions allows one to be more precise about the various possible templates relating to the internal organization of an expansion section. As

---

<sup>19</sup> William Caplin, “Funktionale Komponenten im achttaktigen Satz,” *Musiktheorie* 1 (1986): 239-60; and chapter 3 of *Classical Form*.

<sup>20</sup> Indeed, there is not even any change in the grouping structure (i.e. expansion back out to larger groupings)—a detail that, as Caplin points out, often suffices for hearing the onset of a new initiating function even when all other markers are absent. See Caplin, “What are Formal Functions?” in *Musical Form, Forms and Formenlehre*, ed. Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009), 35.

<sup>21</sup> Caplin, *Classical Form*, 201-203.

Caplin and I have elsewhere argued, it turns out, when one makes that application that most of the expositions Hepokoski and Darcy call continuous correspond to what, from a form-functional perspective, are cases of fusion or blurred boundaries.<sup>22</sup> However different the conceptual nexuses that these categories inhabit may be, the resultant analyses are mostly congruent. As a result, it is possible to translate between them.

With that general point in mind, it is worth pointing out that Larsen's three-part exposition has also made cameos in Caplin's work. In a 2001 article in the *Tijdschrift voor Muziektheorie*, Caplin laid out eight possible punctuation schemes for the classical sonata exposition. The last of these gives a scheme that answers exactly to the category of "blurred boundaries" as laid out in *Classical Form*.<sup>23</sup> Simply put, blurred boundaries arise when the transition lacks a concluding function, the subordinate theme an initiating function, or both. In the last case, transition and subordinate-theme functions *fuse*—that is, they are both presented through a single, formally unarticulated span of music in such a way that transition function at some point—indeed at some "point of conversion"—gives way to subordinate-theme function. As the reader should, I hope, now recognize, Caplin's description of this process essentially aligns with Hepokoski and Darcy's account of the *Entwicklungspartie*.<sup>24</sup>

It is thus entirely possible to present a well-formed form-functional analysis of the exposition of Op. 33 no. 1, movement iv, that construes its divisions in a way mapping

---

<sup>22</sup> William E. Caplin and Nathan John Martin, "The 'Continuous Exposition' and the Concept of Subordinate Theme," paper read at the Seventh International Conference on Music Theory, Tallinn, Estonia, January 7, 2014.

<sup>23</sup> William E. Caplin, "The Classical Sonata Exposition: Cadential Goals and Form-Functional Plans," *Tijdschrift voor Muziektheorie* 6 (2001): 198 and 207-9; Caplin, *Classical Form*, 201-203.

<sup>24</sup> It is also very close to one of the modes of processual form that Janet Schmalfeldt describes in her seminal article "Form as the Process of Becoming: The Beethoven-Hegelian Tradition and the 'Tempest' Sonata," *Beethoven Forum* 4 (1995): 37-71. That article is reprinted in expanded form as chapter one of Schmalfeldt's book *In the Process of Becoming: Analytical and Philosophical Reflections on Musical Form* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). On the different kinds of processual form in play in Schmalfeldt's "Tempest" analysis, see Nathan John Martin and Steven Vande Moortele, "Formal Functions and Retrospective Reinterpretation in the First Movement of Schubert's String Quintet," *Music Analysis* 33 (2014): 130-55; and Steven Vande Moortele, "In Search of Romantic Form," *Music Analysis* 32 (2013): 404-431.

exactly onto Hepokoski and Darcy's "continuous" reading.<sup>25</sup> And indeed, that result generalizes; it is almost always possible to discern the markers of (possibly fused) transition and subordinate-theme functions within the expansion section of a continuous (or three-part) exposition. The locution "subordinate-theme function" is of the essence here. For despite certain misapprehensions to the contrary, Caplin's position is not that every exposition contains a subordinate theme. Rather, it is that every exposition must at a minimum express subordinate-theme function, and this insistence means in turn that every exposition must at the very least contrive to bring about a subordinate-key PAC. In its essence, then, Caplin's position is tantamount to Hepokoski and Darcy's claim that every (non-deformational) exposition should have an EEC.

This striking point of agreement has been obscured by a different, if not unrelated, issue: Caplin's willingness to hear new beginnings where others perceive only *Fortspinnung*.<sup>26</sup> This is an analytical tick—like hearing proliferations of half cadences—that I have come to share; in the finale of Op. 33 no. 1, the exposition's expansion section can, as we have seen, be interpreted as an instance of transition/subordinate-theme fusion. But I would also suggest an alternate analysis, one that accommodates a detail in the music that nagged at my initial hearing. In bar 29, the cello's E always sounded wrong. Of course, there are lightly broken parallel octaves between the outer voices (in bars 27-29), but I'm not sure that these were fundamentally the problem. Rather, the descending-fifth sequence breaks off right at bar 29 in what struck me as an unexpected way. Recognizing that bars 27-31 might in fact represent a new initiating function, and then trying to hear them that way, ironed out the wrinkle: I realized that that the bass-line amounted to a double-neighboring motion (D-E-C-sharp-D) around the local tonic note, a typical motion for a four-bar presentation. And so my original cognitive blip disappeared, as Vasili Byros might say in other contexts, once I found the

---

<sup>25</sup> As indeed, Caplin and I did in the last part of the paper cited in note 22 above.

<sup>26</sup> For a good example, see the analysis of the "Pastoral" Symphony in Caplin, "What are Formal Functions?"

right schema.<sup>27</sup> Thus, in this instance, I have come to think that the exposition not only expresses subordinate-theme function but that it does so through a syntactically complete subordinate theme. The blurred boundary arises solely because the transition lacks a concluding function. Rather than ending with a cadential idea and half cadence, it runs straight into the subordinate theme's beginning. I am far from denying, of course, that this boundary is blurred, let alone that many continuities link the subordinate theme's beginning with the preceding music. My point is only that bars 27-31 *also* represent a new initiation.<sup>28</sup>

Which of these two analyses one ultimately prefers is essentially moot for the theoretical point that I wish to make. Both analyses are well-formed Caplinian readings, concerning which form-functional analysts may legitimately differ, and whose merits are subject to adjudication on grounds other than their conformity to the strictures of Caplin's theorizing.<sup>29</sup> But the theoretical fall-out from either reading for my present purpose is the same: on the first reading, an incomplete transition fuses with what is in effect the second half of a subordinate theme; on the second, it segues instead into a subordinate theme presented in its entirety. If such a transition/subordinate-theme section is followed by another thematic unit—whether one calls it “subordinate theme 2” or “C”—then the resulting structure is essentially Larsen's three-part type.

---

<sup>27</sup> See, in particular, Vasili Byros, “Towards and Archeology of Hearing: Schemata and Eighteenth-Century Consciousness,” *Musica humana* 2 (2010): 235-306.

<sup>28</sup> I more exhaustive investigation of how these measures can be *both* continuational *and* initiating might draw its inspiration from the middle parts of David Lewin, “Music Theory, Phenomenology, and Modes of Perception,” *Music Perception* 3 (1986): 335-73; reprinted in Lewin, *Studies in Music With Text* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006): 59-93.

<sup>29</sup> There is probably no one, at this point in music history, who would confuse Schenkerian analysis with Schenker's own analyses. For a forceful statement of this point, see Poundie Burstein, “Beethoven's Op. 31, No. 2: A Schenkerian Approach,” in *Beethoven's "Tempest" Sonata: Perspectives of Analysis and Performance*, ed. Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 66. The same should hold *mutatis mutandis* for Caplin: his system provides a theoretical framework within which various competing analyses are possible; adjudicating between these, provided that they are well drawn, is a matter of analysis and not of theory. The temptation to conflate Caplinian analysis with Caplin's analyses, though, is far greater than in the Schenkerian case, since Caplin is, at present, the only prominent expositor of his system among senior American theorists (with the exception of Janet Schmalfeldt).

#### *IV. String Quartet in G minor, Op. 74 no. 3, movement I*

To make the point more concretely, I'll turn to the exposition from the opening allegro of Haydn's String Quartet in G minor, Op. 74 no. 3 (see Example 3 in Appendix, p. 24). In a characteristically elegant 1999 analysis, Lauri Surpää divided this exposition into three parts, very much on the lines laid out by Larsen: a laconic main theme (bars 1-8), followed by a lengthy expansion section (bars 11-54), and then a closing theme (bars 55-62) that is repeated (bars 63-70) before it gives way to codettas.<sup>30</sup> It is, of course, the middle part that is of primary concern here. The transition that begins in bar 11 leads first to a premature arrival on the home key dominant in bar 17, with that harmony held as a pedal until bar 20, while the upper parts complete their arc. The next unit, bars 21-22, seems at first to articulate the half cadence missing from the preceding one, but when it is immediately repeated and then followed by a new continuation in bars 25ff, it is reinterpreted retrospectively as the beginning of the transition's second part, roughly in the manner of what Caplin, in other contexts, calls a "false closing section." Having deflected the exposition's tonal orientation towards B-flat by bar 26, the passage arrives at the subordinate key's tonic in bar 28 and then confirms this new focus by an expanded cadential progression spanning from bar 29 to the half-cadence to V of B-flat in bar 32. Thus far we have a concise but otherwise normal two-part transition: a non-modulating first part from bars 11-20, and a modulating second part from bars 21-32.

However, after the subordinate-key half cadence in bar 32, what we hear is more continuation: the grouping structure fragments down to one-bar units, the rushing

---

<sup>30</sup> Lauri Suurpää, "Continuous Exposition and Tonal Structure in Three Late Haydn Works," *Music Theory Spectrum* 21 (1999): 187-90. There is an important proviso to this parsing of the movement's inter-thematic functions (one that I am nevertheless strategically going to ignore): namely that the music in mm. 1-8 does not return in the recapitulation, which begins instead with the music of mm. 11ff. So one either has to say that mm. 11-20 are in fact the main theme, despite their not ending with a cadence; or that mm. 1-8 are, despite their not being reprised. In the former case, mm. 1-8 are probably to be understood as a "motto" preceding the main theme, in the manner described in James Hepokoski, "Formal Process, Sonata Theory, and the First Movement of Beethoven's 'Tempest' Sonata," *Music Theory Online* 16.2 (2010). One might then try to construe a cadence at mm. 19-20 along the lines laid out for the main theme of "Ach, ich fühl's" in my chapter "Mozart's Sonata-Form Arias," in *Formal Functions in Perspective: Essays on Musical Form from Haydn to Adorno*, ed. Steven Vande-Moortele, Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers, and Nathan John Martin (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, forthcoming).

triplets—first slipped in in the second violin in bar 21—run wild in the cello, and the harmony prolongs I<sup>6</sup> of B-flat through to bar 37, where another ECP begins. In the next measure (bar 38), we reach IV, which becomes ii<sup>6</sup> in bar 39 through a standard 5-6 linear progression, and the predominant is further intensified to V<sup>6</sup>/V in the following bar. Clearly, the dominant is nigh—the dominant for which the music has in fact been angling ever since bar 33. But the bass deflects back down to E-flat in bar 41, and that note (harmonized with a dominant 4/2 chord) is in turn pushed back to scale degree 3 (supporting I<sup>6</sup>). The increasingly frantic efforts of bars 42-44 (note the metrical dissonance arising from the cross accents and the crescendo to *ff* implied by the repeated *sforzandi*) do bring us to F in the bass in bar 45, but as the third chord factor in an applied diminished seventh chord, and from there we slide all the way back to bass scale degree  $\hat{2}$  in bar. 46. Its energy spent, a rather deflating progression takes the passage through to the cadential dominant in bar 48, an octave lower than expected, and even that progression collapses in a deceptive cadence at bar 50. So it is left to the ensuing music to salvage what it can, which is the rather glum imperfect authentic cadence in the subordinate key that arrives in bar 54.

Clearly, there has been no suggestion at any point of the beginning of a subordinate theme. And indeed this whole expansion section, beginning all the way back at bar 11, is one of the best examples I know of what Caplin calls transition/subordinate-theme fusion. This forms part of an exposition that is also an excellent illustration of the bait-and-switch subtype of continuous exposition, which is in turn a kind three-part exposition in Larsen's sense.

### *V. Conclusion: Translating*

What I am suggesting is not that these various categories are the same, but only that frequently, in their analytical deployment, they overlap. Put another way, they are often co-extensive, and for this reason, one can generally translate between them. There are, of course, different kinds of translation. It may be, as Walter Benjamin once maintained,



that *pain* to a Frenchman means something different than *Brot* to a German.<sup>31</sup> Yet within the total range of alimentary possibilities, *pain* and *Brot* will tend to pick out the same kinds of objects. Not all translation is like this. The standard English rendering of the Greek word *aretē*, for instance, is profoundly misleading without extensive qualification, since the word “virtue” carries a range of Judea-Christian connotations that are totally foreign to the Greek. So where on this continuum do my proposed translations fall? I would venture that they are more like “bread.” Sharp differences in theoretical perspective notwithstanding—including a fundamental disagreement about which parameters are form-defining—the analytical parsings that results from Larsen’s, Hepokoski and Darcy’s, and Caplin’s categories are not always so different as these authors’ theoretical disagreements might be taken to imply. So I would end with a general plea for some measure of ecumenicism: why not simply take from all these competing constructs whatever is most congenial to our overarching aim? This last is ultimately, I take it, just what David Lewin said it was, namely to hear this music better—more sensitively, more lovingly, and with an ever-deepening appreciation for its many beauties and its manifold complexities.<sup>32</sup> No tools that can help us do that, I would insist in closing, deserve to be discarded.

---

<sup>31</sup> Walter Benjamin, “The Task of the Translator,” in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections* (New York: Schocken Books, 2007), 74.

<sup>32</sup> David Lewin, “Behind the Beyond: A Response to Edward T. Cone,” *Perspectives of New Music* 7 (1969): 62-63.

## VI. Works Cited

- Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." In *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*. New York: Schocken Books, 2007.
- Brown, A. Peter. *Joseph Haydn's Keyboard Music*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- Burnham, Scott. "Criticism, Faith, and the *Idee*: A. B. Marx's Early Reception of Beethoven." *19<sup>th</sup>-Century Music* 13 (1990): 183-92.
- Burstein, Poundie. "Beethoven's Op. 31, No. 2: A Schenkerian Approach." In *Beethoven's "Tempest" Sonata: Perspectives of Analysis and Performance*. Edited by Pieter Bergé. Leuven: Peeters, 2009: 61-85.
- Byros, Vasili. "Towards and Archeology of Hearing: Schemata and Eighteenth-Century Consciousness." *Musica humana* 2 (2010): 235-306.
- Caplin, William. "What are Formal Functions?" In *Musical Form, Forms and Formenlehre*, ed. Pieter Bergé, 21-45. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Classical Sonata Exposition: Cadential Goals and Form-Functional Plans." *Tijdschrift voor Muziektheorie* 6 (2001): 195-209.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*. New York: Oxford, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Funktionale Komponenten im achttaktigen Satz." *Musiktheorie* 1 (1986): 239-60.
- Caplin, William and Nathan John Martin. "The 'Continuous Exposition' and the Concept of Subordinate Theme." Paper read at the Seventh International Conference on Music Theory, Tallinn, Estonia, January 7, 2014.
- Fillion, Michelle. "Sonata Exposition Procedures in Haydn's Keyboard Sonatas." In *Haydn Studies: Proceedings of the International Haydn Congress, Washington, D.C., 1975*. Edited by Jens Peter Larsen, Howard Serwer, and James Webster. New York: Norton, 1981: 475-81.
- Fischer, Wilhelm. "Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Wiener klassischen Stils." *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft* 3 (1915): 24-84.
- Gjerdingen, Robert O. *Music in the Galant Style*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Hepokoski, James. "Formal Process, Sonata Theory, and the First Movement of Beethoven's 'Tempest' Sonata." *Music Theory Online* 16.2 (2010).

Hepokoski, James and Warren Darcy. *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types and Deformations in the Late Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Medial Caesura and Its Role in the Eighteenth-Century Sonata Exposition." *Music Theory Spectrum* 19 (1997): 115-54.

Holtmeier, Ludwig. "Feindliche Übernahme: Gottfried Weber, Adolf Bernhard Marx und die bürgerliche Harmonielehre des 19. Jahrhunderts." *Musik und Aesthetik* 63/2 (2012): 5-25.

Kerman, Joseph and Gary Tomlinson. *Listen*, 4th ed. Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1999.

Larsen, Jens Peter. "Sonateform-Probleme." In *Festschrift Friederich Blume zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Anna Amalie Abert and Wilhelf Pfannkuch. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1963: 221-30. Translated as "Sonata-Form Problems" by Ulrich Krämer [*recte*: Gerald C Graue] in *Handel, Haydn, and the Viennese Classical Style*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988. Translation reprinted in *HAYDN: The Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 3.2 (fall 2013).

Lewin, David. "Music Theory, Phenomenology, and Modes of Perception." *Music Perception* 3 (1986): 335-73. Reprinted in Lewin, *Studies in Music With Text*, 53-108. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Behind the Beyond: A Response to Edward T. Cone." *Perspectives of New Music* 7 (1969): 59-69.

Ludwig, Alexander. "Expecting the Unexpected: Haydn's Three-Part Expositions." *Lumen* 32 (2013): 31-40.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Three-Part Expositions in the String Quartets of Joseph Haydn." Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 2010.

Martin, Nathan John. "Mozart's Sonata-Form Arias." In *Formal Functions in Perspective: Essays on Musical Form from Haydn to Adorno*. Edited by Steven Vande-Moortele, Julie Pedneault-Deslauriers, and Nathan John Martin. Rochester: Rochester University Press, forthcoming.

- Martin, Nathan John and Steven Vande Moortele. "Formal Functions and Retrospective Reinterpretation in the First Movement of Schubert's String Quintet" *Music Analysis* 33 (2014): 130-55.
- Marx, Adolf Bernhard. *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition, praktisch-theoretisch*, 4 vols. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1837-1847.
- Miyake, Jan. "Readdressing Haydn's Formal Models: Common Paths Through Expositions." *Theory and Practice* 34 (2009): 31-46.
- Neuwirth, Markus. "Recomposed Recapitulations in the Sonata-Form Movements of Joseph Haydn and His Contemporaries." Ph.D. dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2013.
- Rosen, Charles. *Sonata Forms*, revised ed. New York: Norton, 1988.
- Schmalfeldt, Janet. *In the Process of Becoming: Analytical and Philosophical Reflections on Musical Form*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Form as the Process of Becoming: The Beethoven-Hegelian Tradition and the 'Tempest' Sonata." *Beethoven Forum* 4 (1995): 37-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Cadential Processes: The Evaded Cadence and the 'One More Time' Technique." *Journal of Musicological Research* 12 (1992): 1-52.
- Suurpää, Lauri. "Continuous Exposition and Tonal Structure in Three Late Haydn Works." *Music Theory Spectrum* 21 (1999): 187-90.
- Vande Moortele, Steven. "In Search of Romantic Form." *Music Analysis* 32 (2013): 404-431
- Webster, James. *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

## Appendix: Musical Examples

Example 1: Haydn, Keyboard Sonata in C Minor, Hob. XVI:20, mvt. I, bars 1-37.

Moderato [Allegro moderato]

a) b) c) Original et al.

Martin, Nathan John. "Larsen's Legacy: The Three-Part Exposition and the New *Formenlenre*."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 4.2 (Fall 2014), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2014. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

Adagio

Tempo I

*calando*

*ten.*

*smorz.*

*leggero*

*legato*

*cresc.*

*cresc.*

*a)*

2

## Example 2: Haydn, String Quartet in B minor, Op. 33 no. 1, mvt. IV, bars 11-39.

TR(sentential, incomplete)  
8-m presentation  
cbi  
bi

ci

cbi (repeated)

I V I

7

cont (model)

(sequence)

V I

D+: iv  
ii

ST (8-m sentence, expanded)  
4-m presentation  
bi

(sequence)

bi (dom version)

continuation (Prinner-based)

13

V I V<sub>3</sub> I

Martin, Nathan John. "Larsen's Legacy: The Three-Part Exposition and the New *Formenlenre*."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 4.2 (Fall 2014), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2014. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

20

10 10 10 10

$I^6$  IV  $I^6$   $V^7$   $V^4_3$

abandoned

28

10 10 10 10 10

$\frac{6}{5}$  I  $I^6$  IV  $V^4_3$

ECP

cad (failed)

34

tr tr tr tr tr tr tr

$\frac{5}{3}$  I  $I^6$  IV  $V^4_3$   $\frac{5}{3}$  I

evaded

PAC



MTh (8-m cbi+cadential hybrid)

cbi  
bi

ci

cont  
cad

f<sub>i</sub>(<sup>5</sup>)

6

Ger<sup>6</sup>

V

HC

TR/STh1

TR1(non-mod., sentential)

p<sub>i</sub>

V

VI

V<sub>3</sub> → iv<sub>3</sub>

v(<sub>7</sub><sup>9</sup>) = <sub>4</sub><sup>8</sup>/<sub>4</sub><sup>8</sup>

dom. arr. (premature)

TR2(mod., sentential)  
pres(false closing)

bi

3

3

3

iv<sup>6</sup>

V

cont

f

f

f

iv

Bb+: ii

Martin, Nathan John. "Larsen's Legacy: The Three-Part Exposition and the New *Formenlenre*."

HAYDN: *Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 4.2 (Fall 2014), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2014. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

2

cad (failed) cont=>cad

26

V<sup>7</sup> IV<sup>6</sup><sub>4</sub> V<sup>6</sup><sub>5</sub> I ECP I<sup>6</sup><sub>8</sub> IV V<sup>6</sup><sub>5</sub>

abandoned

STh1(second half only)  
fr cont=>cad

32

V<sup>(8)</sup><sub>7</sub> (I) V<sup>4</sup><sub>2</sub> I<sup>6</sup> (V<sup>4</sup><sub>2</sub>) I<sup>6</sup> (V<sup>4</sup><sub>2</sub>) I V<sup>7</sup> 4<sub>2</sub>

HC ECP1 ...

37

I<sup>6</sup> IV<sup>5</sup> 6<sub>ii</sub><sup>6</sup><sub>5</sub> V<sup>6</sup><sub>5</sub>/V<sub>3</sub> V<sup>4</sup><sub>2</sub> I<sup>6</sup> V<sup>4</sup><sub>3</sub>

abandoned

[illegible][illegible]

Martin, Nathan John. "Larsen's Legacy: The Three-Part Exposition and the New *Formenlenre*."

HAYDN: *Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 4.2 (Fall 2014), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2014. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

4

58

failed cons  
bi

ci

STh2 (repeated)

I  
IAC

I

IV

V<sup>7</sup>

I  
IAC

64

69

closing section